

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/992,558	KRISHNA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	J. Derek Rutten	2192	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Appealed

 (1) J. Derek Rutten.

 (3) Margaret Anderson, Reg. 44,182.

 (2) Pehr Jansson, Reg. No. 35,759.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 20 June 2006
**Time:** 1:30
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

112

Claims discussed:

1, 4, 16, 19, 29, 32, 44, 48, 59, 62, 66, 77

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: An interview was conducted with Mr. Jansson regarding allowable subject matter. Mr. Rutten explained that the arguments provided were convincing, but that the independent claims did not appear to be claiming the invention as argued on page 3 of the Appeal Brief filed 11/2/05 and would be subject to a possible rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. However, Mr. Rutten suggested that claim 4 appeared to properly claim the invention as argued by the Applicant. Mr. Rutten suggested incorporating the subject matter of claim 4 into claim 1, and similarly for the other independent claims. Mr. Jansson agreed to discuss the amendment with his client. Mr. Rutten suggested that action on the Appeal would be made by the end of the week. On 6/22/06, Mr. Rutten followed up with an attempt to contact Mr. Jansson, but instead spoke with Ms. Anderson who indicated that she could discuss the issues with the client. In another call on 6/23/06, Ms. Anderson agreed to an examiner's amendment.